

No. 05-2816

Submitted: May 25, 2006
Filed: May 26, 2006

Before ARNOLD, BYE, and COLLOTON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Attorney Oscar Stilley appeals the district court's¹ imposition of sanctions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11. We find no abuse of discretion in the imposition of Rule 11 sanctions. See Cooter & Gell v. Hartmarx Corp., 496 U.S. 384, 405 (1990). We are troubled by Stilley's mischaracterization of the record as to the applicability of Rule 11's safe-harbor provision and Rule 11(c)(1)(B). We reject Stilley's argument that the limitations the district court imposed on his practice constitute attorney discipline, as opposed to Rule 11 sanctions. See Stilley v. James, 48 Fed. Appx. 595, 597 (8th Cir. 2002) (unpublished per curiam) (finding no abuse of discretion in applying appropriately fashioned Rule 11 sanctions enjoining Stilley from filing future cases involving issues that had been litigated or raised in three lawsuits and two appeals; court acted appropriately by helping stop Stilley's pursuit of fruitless litigation). Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

¹The Honorable G. Thomas Eisele, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, sitting by designation in the Western District of Arkansas.